



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/877,522	06/08/2001	Robert D. Bushey	10010240-1 1432	
7590 09/09/2004			EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			HARRELL, ROBERT B	
Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			2142	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/877,522	BUSHEY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert B. Harrell	2142	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 Ju</u>	une 2001.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	·		
Disposition of Claims			
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 June 2001</u> is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. Es have been received in Application Es have been received in Application Es have been receive Eu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20030414.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: see attached	ite atent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/877,522

Art Unit: 2142

- 1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.
- 2. The Oath or Declaration, of record, is defective as it is not signed by the inventors. However, Office records indicates activities on, or about, 10/19/2001 which made the application complete. Since United States Applications have gone through an Image File Wrapper (IFW) process (applications are scanned for ease of computerized image retrieval), examiner assumes there was submitted by the applicants a new Oath or Declaration which was inadvertently separated during the IFW process. Therefore, a copy of the new Oath or Declaration properly executed is required in response to this office action.
- 3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
- 4. The applicant should use this period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings, and specifically claims (i.e., in claim 1 (line 2) "communication" should read as —in communication—, "adopted" should be —adapted—in claim 9 (line 4), "the means" of claim 10 (line 1) should be —means—(delete "the", or correct claim 9 accordingly), and other such minor like errors that do not rise to the level warranting an objection and/or rejection(s) as the meaning of the claim(s) (is)are fully understandable by a reasonable person). Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.
- 5 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language;
- 6 Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by McCannon et al. (US 6,607,314 B1).
- 7. Prior to addressing the grounds of the rejections below, should this application ever be the subject of public review by third parties not so versed with the technology (i.e., access to IFW through Public PAIR (as found on http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair)), this Office action will usually refer an applicant's attention to relevant and helpful elements,

Art Unit: 2142

figures, and/or text upon which the Office action relies to support the position taken. Thus, the following citations are neither all-inclusive nor all-exclusive in nature as the whole of the reference is cited and relied upon in this action.

- 8. Per claim 1, McCannon taught an appliance (e.g., see figure 1 (PRINTER 10)) configured for connection to a network (e.g., see figure 1 (44)) and in communication with a device (e.g., see figure 1 (30 and/or 40+42 and/or 46)) connected to the network, the appliance comprising:
- a) a processing device (e.g., see figure 1 (14)) configured to control operation of the appliance (e.g., see col. 5 (lines 5-10; line 5 "control"));
- b) memory ((e.g., see figure 1 (16) and col. 5 (line 8 "memory")) including logic configured to receive software (e.g., see col. 4 (lines 60-61 "device driver"), and col. 5 (line 7 "driver routines")) that facilitates communication between the appliance and the device from a software source (e.g., see figure 1 (46) and see col. 29-40)); and c) a network interface device (e.g., see figure 1 (12) and col. 5 (line
- c) a network interface device (e.g., see figure 1 (12) and col. 5 (line 29 "interface")) with which the appliance communicates with the software source (e.g., see col. 5 (lines 27-40)).
- 9. Per claims 2 and 3, see col. 3 (lines 21-30). It is noted that claim 1 above, recites "logic". Such is broad enough to reasonably interpret either software logic, hardware logic, or combination since the two are logical equivalent. Thus the routine in the memory performing the actions outline in this reference (for example col. 3 (lines 21-30)) was such logic.
- 10. Per claim 4, see figure 2 (116 (at bottom of sheet)).
- 11. Per claim 5, see col. 6 (line 67 "search engine") and col. 7 (line 16 "searching"). As for "periodically", claimed in claim 5, the process is repeated per col. 5 (line 59) and thus a temporal order as further provided in figure 3 and col. 7 (lines 20-49).
- 12. Per claim 6, see figure 2 (106 in the center decision diamond) and col. 7 (line 3).
- 13. Per claim 7, such is the very nature of "driver" as covered in col. 1 (line 12-37).
- 14. Per claim 8, see figure 1 (20 "IMAGE")).
- 15. Per claim 9, McCannon taught an appliance (e.g., see figure 1 (PRINTER 10)) configured for direct connection to a network (e.g., see figure 1 (44)) and in communication with a device (e.g., see figure 1 30 and/or 40+42 and/or 46)) connected to the network, the appliance comprising:
- <u>a)</u> a processing device (e.g., see figure 1 (14)) configured to control operation of the appliance (e.g., see col. 5 (lines 5-10; line 5 "control"));
- b) acquisition module ((e.g., see figure 1 (16) and col. 5 (line 8 "memory")) [adapted] to receive software (e.g., see col. 4 (lines 60-61 "device driver"), and col. 5 (line 7 "driver routines")) that

Art Unit: 2142

facilitates communication between the appliance and the device from a software source (e.g., see figure 1 (46) and see col. 29-40)); and c) a network interface device (e.g., see figure 1 (12) and col. 5 (line 29 "interface")) with which the appliance communicates with the software source (e.g., see col. 5 (lines 27-40)).

- 16. Per claim 10, see col. 3 (lines 21-30).
- 17. Per claim 11, see figure 2 (116 (at bottom of sheet)).
- Per claim 12, see col. 6 (line 67 "search engine") and col. 7 (line 16 "searching"). As for "periodically", claimed in claim 5, the process is repeated per col. 5 (line 59) and thus a temporal order as further provided in figure 3 and col. 7 (lines 20-49).
- Per claim 13, see figure 2 (106 in the center decision diamond) and col. 7 (line 3).
- 20. Per claim 14, see figure 1 (20 "IMAGE")).
- Per claim 15, the printer also serves as a storage unit per col. 6 (lines 15-19).
- 22. Per claims 16-20, such a method does not teach or define above the correspondingly rejected claims and were shown above and clearly anticipated by the reference in which the appliance was the printer and were any of the remaining device on the network was the claimed separate device.
- 23. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the data of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).
- 24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert B. Harrell whose telephone number is (703) 305-9692. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and on weekends from 6:00 am to 12 noon Eastern Standard Time.
- If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack B. Harvey, can be reached on (703) 308-9705. The fax phone number for all papers is (703) 872-9306.
- 26. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

ROBERT B. HARRELL PRIMARY EXAMINER

GROUP 2142